



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,789	11/07/2001	Jonas Lee	941-002	1847
38137	ABELMAN, FRAYNE & SCHWAB  REID, CHERYL M  666 THIRD AVENUE, 10TH FLOOR		EXAMINER	
			ERYL M	
			PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2142	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/007,789	LEE ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Cheryl M. Reid	2142			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNION (136(a). In no event, however, may a rewill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON (6), cause the application to become AB	CATION.  eply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 F</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This	August 2005. s action is non-final.				
3)	, <del> _</del>					
D::4	·	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	7. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
_	ion of Claims					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	nom obnolation.				
·	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examina	er.				
• —	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc		by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyan	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received in A	pplication No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	received in this National Stage			
	application from the International Burea	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
* 9	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.			
Attachmen	t(c)					
	u(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) T Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)			
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		s)/Mail Date			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/007,789 Page 2

Art Unit: 2142

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-20 have been examined.

#### Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1, 15, and 20 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 6-7, 15, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 6128663) in view of Eldering et al (US 6820277).
- In regards to claim 1 and 20, Thomas teaches of : a server operatively connected to a user terminal operated by a user (col 1 lines 65-67, col 2, line 1), an advertising administration module, configured to maintain a plurality of advertising content associated with at least one advertising campaign (col 7, lines 48-55); said user terminal interface configured to retrieve user information corresponding to said user terminal, for use by said advertising administration module(col 2, lines 45-50); said decision maker module configured to select one of said advertising content associated with at least one advertising campaign, based on said user information including consumer data specific to the user and obtained at least directly from said user terminal, so that the user

terminal coupled to said server receives the selected advertising content corresponding to information retrieved by said server (col 2, lines 55-65). Thomas does not explicitly teach of a user terminal interface module coupled to said advertising administration module nor a decision maker module coupled to said advertising administration module. In an analogous art, Eldering teaches on these aspects (col 5, lines 9-10, col 6, lines 5-10, fig 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings because the inventions are analogous art (providing targeted advertisements to consumers). One of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention would have been motivated by the reasons discussed byThomas (col 1, lines 60-65).

s. In regards to claim 15, Thomas teaches of: a server operatively connected to a user terminal operated by a user (col 1 lines 65-67, col 2, line 1), an advertising administration module, configured to maintain a plurality of advertising content associated with at least one advertising campaign (col 7, lines 48-55); said user terminal interface configured to retrieve user information corresponding to said user terminal, for use by said advertising administration module(col 2, lines 45-50); said decision maker module configured to select one of said advertising content associated with at least one advertising campaign, based on said user information including consumer data specific to the user and obtained at least directly from said user terminal, wherein the consumer data specifically identifying the user and obtained at least directly from the user terminal is selected from the group of: the age of the consumer, the economic status of the consumer, and the language of preference of the consumer (col 11, lines 60-65, col 12,

Application/Control Number: 10/007,789

Art Unit: 2142

lines 10-15) so that the user terminal coupled to said server receives the selected advertising content corresponding to information retrieved by said server (col 2, lines 55-65); selecting the mode of appearance of said advertising content (col 2, lines 5-10, col 4, lines 5-10). Thomas does not explicitly teach of a user terminal interface module coupled to said advertising administration module( Eldering, col 5, lines 9-10) nor a decision maker module coupled to said advertising administration module ( Eldering ,col 6, lines 5-10) nor a design user interface module configured to allow the user using the user terminal to specify a set of rules corresponding to an advertising campaign, said set of rules defining conditions for which specific advertising content is selected (Eldering, Col 5, lines 10-35). In an analogous art, Eldering teaches on these aspects (col 5, lines 9-10, col 6, lines 5-10, fig 1,, Col 5, lines 10-35). Refer to claim 1 for motivation.

Page 4

- 6. In regards to claim 6-7, Eldering teaches of a memory unit that stores a set of rules corresponding to each of said advertising campaigns, said set of rules defining conditions for which specific advertising content is selected (col 5, lines 30-35, fig 1, item 102) and an information template flesh-out module coupled to said advertising maintenance module configured to retrieve information required by said rules (col 6, lines 1-20, fig 1).
- 7. Claims 2-5, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Eldering as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pareskh.

- 8. The rejections for claims 2-5, 17 were set forth in a previous office action mailed on 1/26/05. Please refer to claim 1 for motivation.
- 9. Claims 8-9, 10-14, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Eldering as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Liu.
- 10. The rejections for claims 8-9, 10-14 were set forth in a previous office action mailed on 1/26/05. Please refer to claim 1 for motivation.
- 11. In regards to claim 18, Liu teaches of .. cookie ... (col 16, lines 30-35). Please refer to claim 1 for motivation.
- 12. In regards to claim 19, Liu teaches of... configured to analyze response rate of each advertising.....(col 12, line 15, col 33, lines 50-65, col 34, lines 5-25). Please refer to claim 1 for motivation.
- 13. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Eldering as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Welsh et al (US 6757691).
- In regards to claim 16, neither Thomas nor Eldering explicitly teach of the limitations. In an analogous art, Welsh teaches of wherein said user information includes weather conditions in a geographical location of said user terminal (col 3, lines 40-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings because the inventions are analogous art

(providing targeted advertisements to consumers). One of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention would have been motivated by the reasons discussed by Thomas (col 1, lines 60-65).

### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M. Reid whose telephone number is 571 272 3903. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmr

BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER